



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/667,460	09/22/2000	Richard Crump	2204/A39	1394
2101 7590 03/23/2004 BROMBERG & SUNSTEIN LLP 125 SUMMER STREET BOSTON, MA 02110-1618			EXAMINER VU, VIET DUY	
			ART UNIT 2154	PAPER NUMBER 7
DATE MAILED: 03/23/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/667,460

Applicant(s)

CRUMP ET AL.

Examiner

Viet Vu

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 February 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 13 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 14-30, 32-36, 38, 40, 42 and 44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 31, 37, 39, 41, 43, 45 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2154

Art Rejections:

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-12, 14-30, 32-36, 38, 40, 42 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denison et al, U.S. pat. No. 6,581,108 in view of Arumainayagam et al, U.S. pat. No. 5,493,607.

Per claims 1-7, Denison discloses a system and method for providing multi-domain address translation comprising:

- a) a management information base containing objects defining a numbers of mask/filter addresses for detecting packets requiring

Art Unit: 2154

domain-specific network addresses translation (see col 3, lines 32-43 and col 5, lines 8-20),

b) a management agent for identifying and routing a SNMP packet to the management information base for payload address translation (see col 3, lines 1-30).

It is noted that details of the management information base and SNMP packet are well known in the art (see col 3, line 56 - col 4, line 7).

Denison does not explicitly teach defining a domain for the number of network addresses. The use of address domain in network address translation is well known in the art as disclosed by Arumainayagam (see Arumainayagam's col 5, lines 32-63). Particularly, each inbound/outbound domain table/pool can be defined by a range of addresses or a starting point of a range and a length of a range (see Arumainayagam's col 3, line 64 - col 4, line 20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Denison with Arumainayagam's teachings because it would have enabled multi-domain address translation in Denison.

Claims 8-12, 14-30, 32-36, 38, 40, 42 and 44 are similar in scope as that of claims 1-7 and hence are rejected for the same rationale set forth above for claims 1-7.

Art Unit: 2154

Allowable Subject Matter:

4. Claims 31, 37, 39, 41, 43 and 45 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

5. Claim 13 is allowed over prior art of record.

Conclusion:

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Viet Vu whose telephone number is 703-305-9597. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8:00am to 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee, can be reached on (703) 305-8498.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-9600. The Group fax number is 703-872-9306.



VIET D. VU
PRIMARY EXAMINER